

as alleged in the office action. For example, Applicant respectfully notes that the structure of claim 1 is also in independent claims 13, 17 and 23. Accordingly, the combinations do require the particulars of the subcombination. Therefore, the restriction requirement should be withdrawn. If the restriction requirement is maintained, Applicant respectfully requests a showing as to what subcombination of claim 1 is not included in the other pending independent claims.


If necessary, Applicant elects the claims in Group I, namely claims 1-12 for examination and withdraws the other claims without prejudice. However, based on the remarks above, it is believed that the restriction requirement is not proper in this particular instance and accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims be examined together.

In addition, the office action notes that the Darnfors reference allegedly teaches a diagonal seal 4 and openings 7 and 8 for each compartment. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the cushion in Darnfors is a circular cushion and contains a separation of two inflatable compartments from each other through a curved shaped forming circular compartments. (See for example, column 1, lines 54-59). Other differences will also be recognized by those of ordinary skill in the art.

The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/3/06

By:   
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.  
222 N. LaSalle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
Phone: (312) 609-7599  
Fax: (312) 609-5005